

****NOT FOR PRINTED PUBLICATION****

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
LUFKIN DIVISION

CROCKETT JACOB RODDAM	§	
VS.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 9:18cv173
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	§	

ORDER ACCEPTING THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Crockett Jacob Roddam, proceeding *pro se*, filed the above-styled motion to vacate, set aside or correct sentence. The court referred the matter to the Honorable Keith F. Giblin, United States Magistrate Judge, for consideration pursuant to applicable orders of this court.

The Magistrate Judge has submitted a Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge concerning this case. The Magistrate Judge recommends the motion to vacate, set aside or correct sentence be denied.

The court has received and considered the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge, along with the record and pleadings. No objections were filed to the Report and Recommendation.

ORDER

The proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law of the Magistrate Judge are correct and the report of the Magistrate Judge is **ACCEPTED**. A final judgment will be entered denying this motion to vacate, set aside or correct sentence.


In addition, the movant is not entitled to the issuance of a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a judgment denying collateral habeas relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* U.S.C. § 2253. The standard for granting a certificate of appealability requires a movant to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84; *Elizalde v. Dretke*, 362 F.3d 323,

****NOT FOR PRINTED PUBLICATION****

328 (5th Cir. 2004). In making a substantial showing, the movant need not establish that he should prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *Slacke*, 529 U.S. at 483-84; *Avila v. Quarterman*, 560 F.3d 299, 304 (5th Cir. 2009). Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability should be resolved in favor of the movant. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir. 2000).

In this case, the movant has not shown that the issues raised are subject to debate among jurists of reason. In addition, the questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. As a result, a certificate of appealability shall not be issued.

So ORDERED and SIGNED, Jun 10, 2021.



Ron Clark
Senior Judge